arXiv:1604.04436v1 [math.CO] 15 Apr 2016

A FAMILY OF ω_1 MANY TOPOLOGICAL TYPES OF LOCALLY FINITE TREES.

JORGE BRUNO

Abstract. Two rooted locally finite trees are considered equivalent if both can be embedded into each other as topological minors by means of tree-order preserving mappings. By exploiting Nash-William's Theorem, Matthiesen provided a non-constructive proof of the uncountability of such equivalence classes, thus answering a question of van der Holst. As an open problem, Matthiesen asks for a constructive proof of this fact. The purpose of this paper is to provide one such construction; working solely within ZFC we illustrate a collection of ω_1 many topological types of rooted trees. In particular, we also show that this construction strengthens that of Mathiesen in that it also applies to *free* (unrooted) trees of degree two.

1. Introduction

For two rooted trees T and U we say that $\phi : V(T) \to V(U)$ is an *embedding* of T into U if there is an extension of ϕ from a subdivision of T to the smallest subtree U_T of U containing all vertices from $\phi(T)$. Of course, there must be no other vertex from U_T between the root of U and ϕ's image of T's root. Equivalently, one can define this embedding by using the *tree-order*: for a tree T, $a \leq b$ provided that a lies in the path from the root of T to b. In light of this, an embedding between two trees is then a tree-order preserving function $T \to U$. If any embedding $T \to U$ exists, T is said to be a *topological minor* of U and we write $T \preceq U$. It is simple to show that the collection of all locally finite trees with the topological minor relation forms a quasi-ordered set of size $\mathfrak{c}$ (i.e., size continuum). When both $T \preceq Y$ and $U \preceq T$ are true, T and U are said to be *equivalent* and the equivalence classes generated by this relation are called *topological types*. A natural question to ask is:

Question 1.1. *What is the size of the partially ordered set generated by considering all locally finite trees modulo this topological equivalence?*

This question was originally posed by H. van der Holst and partially answered by Matthiesen in [4] by non-constructive means. More precisely, let λ denote the number of topological types of locally finite trees: clearly, $\omega \leq \lambda \leq \mathfrak{c}$

Date: April 18, 2016.

and Matthiesen refined it to $\omega_1 \leq \lambda \leq \mathfrak{c}$ by clever use of Nash-William's Theorem (which states that the infinite rooted trees are better-quasi-ordered under topological minor [5], [3]). A good introduction to the subject can be found in [2]. Matthiesen leaves as an open problem a constructive proof of this fact. Working solely within ZFC, we address Mathiesen's problem and extend her result by providing a construction of ω_1 many topological types of free locally finite trees. In light of the Continuum Hypothesis (CH) this is the largest construction allowed within ZFC. We address this and other affine issues at the end of the paper.

2. The construction

We will inductively define a family $\mathcal{T} = \{T_\alpha \mid \alpha < \omega_1\}$ with the property that for all $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$, $T_\alpha \preceq T_\beta \not\preceq T_\alpha$. This collection would then be a specimen of an uncountable collection of topological types. Let's begin by defining T_1 to be a ray $R = v_1v_2v_3\ldots$ (denoted simply by R from now on). The tree T_2 will be constructed by *attaching* (by *attach* we mean "to join with an edge") to each vertex of R a copy of T_1 by its root. The resulting tree resembles a comb whose teeth are copies of T_1 and we denote this tree by T_2. In general:

- For $\alpha+1 = \beta$: T_β is forged by a ray R so that each vertex v_i is attached to the root of a - unique - copy of T_α.
- Whenever β is limit: choose any strictly monotone and cofinal $\psi : \omega \to \beta$, for each v_i in the ray R attach a - unique - copy of $T_{\psi(i)}$ by its root.

For each tree T_α the ray used on its construction will be called its *spine*. Next we prove our main result.

Theorem 2.1. *For any $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$, $T_\alpha \preceq T_\beta \not\preceq T_\alpha$.*

Proof. By design it should be clear that for any $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$, $T_\alpha \preceq T_\beta$. We thus focus on the latter assertion and notice that $T_1 \preceq T_2 \not\preceq T_1$ starts the induction. For any $\beta = \alpha+1$ notice that since $\mathcal{T}$ is nested, we need only show that $T_\beta \not\preceq T_\alpha$. If β is limit, we still have to show that $T_\beta \not\preceq T_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \beta$. Assume that for a given $\alpha < \beta < \gamma < \omega_1$ we have $T_\alpha \preceq T_\beta \not\preceq T_\alpha$.

γ is a limit ordinal:

Let $\psi : \omega \to \gamma$ be the strictly monotone and cofinal function defining T_γ. Assume that for some $\alpha < \gamma$, $T_\gamma \preceq T_\alpha$ and notice that for some $j \in \omega$ we have $\alpha < \psi(j)$. Since the j$^{\text{th}}$ branch of T_γ is $T_{\psi(j)}$, this then yields $T_{\psi(j)} \preceq T_\alpha$, an impossibility.

$\gamma = \beta + 1$:

Assume that there is an embedding from T_γ into T_β and consider any branch T^i_β (the i$^{\text{th}}$ copy of T_β along T_γ's spine). The embedding cannot map T^i_β strictly

within any branch that stems off of T_β's spine (recall that by induction T_β cannot be embedded into any such branch). However, if any vertex of T^i_β is mapped to a vertex, p, on the spine of T_β then the since the embedding preserves tree-order (i.e., incomparable vertices are mapped to incomparable vertices) no branch in T_γ higher up than T^i_β can be mapped anywhere above p. This leaves only finitely many branches in T_β for mapping the rest of T_γ. Yielding that at least one branch of T_γ will be mapped within a branch of T_β and another contradiction.

□

Corollary 2.2. *The family $\mathcal{T}$ contains ω_1 many topological types of free locally finite trees.*

Proof. It is evident from the proof of Theorem 2.1 that even considered as free trees, the family $\mathcal{T}$ contains ω_1 many topological types. □

Remark 2.3. Due Nash-Williams Theorem we are forced to construct well-ordered chains when searching for large families of topological types of locally finite trees; the *width* of any such family must be finite and thus the bulk of its cardinality must be derived from its height.

3. Conclusions

Working within ZFC and due to CH, in terms of cardinality, one cannot construct a larger example than the one presented here. It remains an open question whether or not it is a ZFC theorem that any family of topological types of locally finite trees must have cardinality of at most ω_1.

Question 3.1. *Is it a theorem of ZFC that there does not exists a family of topological types whose size exceeds ω_1?*

It is simple to show that any tree that contains a copy of all trees in $\mathcal{T}$ must have a copy of the full binary tree. By our closing remark above, this then suggest that the bulk of any potentially large family of topological types (consistent with ZFC) must be developed from well-ordered chains of trees containing the full binary tree. More precisely we have the following questions.

Question 3.2. *How many topological types of locally finite trees with a finite number of rays are there?*

For any well-ordered set, its *order type* is the only ordinal which is order-equivalent to it.

Question 3.3. *Is it possible to construct, for any $\alpha \in \omega_1$ a family of topological types of locally finite trees of order type α?*

We deal with the above questions in [1].

References

[1] J Bruno and P. Szeptycki. On families of toplogical types of locally finite trees. *(In preparation)*.

[2] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph theory*, volume 173 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 2005.

[3] Daniela Kühn. On well-quasi-ordering infinite trees—Nash-Williams's theorem revisited. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 130(3):401–408, 2001.

[4] Lilian Matthiesen. There are uncountably many topological types of locally finite trees. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 96(5):758–760, 2006.

[5] C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams. On well-quasi-ordering infinite trees. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 61:697–720, 1965.